

THE MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH DAY

Wednesday, 8th March 1961.

The House met in the Assembly Hall, Vidhana Soudha, Bangalore. at One of the Clock.

Mr. SPEAKER.—(Sri S. R. KANTHI, B.A., LL.B.), in the Chair.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ದಿವಸವೇ ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿವಸ....

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ (ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಈಗ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಚರ್ಚೆಯ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಇಡೀ ಮೂರು ದಿವಸಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡಲು ಈ ದಿವಸವನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

MEMBER'S REPRESENTATION

Re. THE DEBATE ON NO CONFIDENCE MOTION.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಮಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರು ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅರ್ಧ ದಿವಸವನ್ನಾದರೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅನಂತರ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಆದರೆ ನೀವು ಆ ದಿವಸ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕಾರಾವಕಾಶ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಆ ದಿವಸ ತಾವು Consider ಮಾಡೋಣ ಎಂತ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸೋಣವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ನಭೆಯವರು ಎರಡು-ಮೂರು ದಿವಸಗಳ ತನಕ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಪೂರ್ತಿ ನಮಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಾಕೆಂತ ಕಾಣುತ್ತೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಮೇಲೆ, ಕಡೆಗೆ ನನಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕದಿದಾಳಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—(ಕಂದಾಯ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಎದುರು ಪಕ್ಷದವರು “ನನ್ನನು ಗೊಮತೇಶ್ವರ” ಎಂತ ಬೈದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ನಾನೀಗ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳದವರಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಒಪ್ಪು ಅವಕಾಶ ಬೇಕೆಂಬಂತೆ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಬಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟು ಸೊಗಸಾಗಿ ಬೈದಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಸೊಗಸಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಬೈಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೂ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಪಕ್ಷ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಗಂಟೆಗಳ ಕಾಲವಾದರೂ ಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಪಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ (ರಾಮದುರ್ಗ).—ನಮಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳವನ್ನು ಟೀಕಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ 8 ದಿವಸದ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಸಾಲದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಇಡೀ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ, ನಾಳೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅರ್ಧ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಬೇಕೇ ಬೇಕು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡಲು ನನಗೆ ಒಂದು ಆಪ್ತರು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ನಾನೇ 'ಮೂವರ್ ಆಫ್ ದಿ ಮೋಷನ್'.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನನಗೆ ನಿಯಮ, ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳು ಗೊತ್ತಿವೆ. ನೀವೂ ಹಳಬರು. ಆದರೆ ಆ ರೂಲ್ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಓದುತ್ತೇನೆ :

'294 (3) A member who has moved a motion may speak again by way of reply, and if the motion is moved by a private member, the Minister concerned may, with the permission of the Speaker, speak (whether he has previously spoken in the debate or not) after the mover has replied ;'

ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥ ಇಷ್ಟೇ : ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವದ ಮೇಲೆ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡಲು ಹಕ್ಕಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಈ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಸೂಚಕರು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಅಂದರೆ "after the mover's reply to the motion" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ನನಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೇ ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, no. The Government or the Ministers have got two chances to speak; one is, by way of intervening and another by way of final reply. I cannot compel any Minister to intervene and reply to this debate by way of intervention. That is why, I made my position very clear. I wanted to know from the Government whether they wanted to intervene or reply.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—As far as we are concerned, we do not want to intervene in the debate but we want to reply finally.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ಮೋಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಒಂದು ಪಾರ್ಟ್. ಆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ನನಗೆ ರಿಪ್ಲೈ ಕೊಡಲು ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಡವೇ ? I want to reply to the Government's reply.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not possible under the Rules.

Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, under rule 295, it is the reply of the mover of the Motion that is conclusive.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Subject to sub-rule (3) of Rule 294.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—Yes, Sir; I have read it. Normally, the reply by the Mover shall conclude the debate. It is only when the Speaker is convinced that is necessary that the Minister also should speak, then, with the permission of the Speaker, the minister can intervene in the debate; not otherwise. We cannot decide at this stage whether it would be necessary for the Minister to intervene again if the Mover of the Motion concluded the debate.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕೇನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಾ? ತಾವು 3ನೆಯ ಉಪನಿಯಮವನ್ನು ಓದಿ..... ಈಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವದ ಸೂಚಕರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಅಥವಾ ಮೊದಲು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಎಂಬುದು. There is no question of my permission. If any Minister wants to take part in the debate before the mover has replied, there will be no question of my granting permission because he has a right. Now they want the permission of the chair to reply at the end. Whether I should give such permission or not is the question now.

†**Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.**—Rule 294 (3) appears to be the subject-matter of difficulty. After all, it is only a permissive provision which enables the Speaker to allow the Minister to speak finally, if he has spoken once or even if he had not participated in the debate. When that is the position it does not confer a right on the Minister concerned to finally conclude the debate. 295 would be the normal rule whereby the mover of a motion gets the right to conclude the debate. It is only in extraordinary circumstances, wherein the chair is of the opinion that the Minister might be allowed the chance to speak again, that is twice over, or alternatively, if he has not spoken, once again.

There is another difficulty. The rule refers to one Minister. Is it the interpretation that includes all the Ministers? Even if it is assumed that the present interpretation is correct, even that right to conclude the debate will be that of an individual Minister and not all the Ministers. If for example, the Chief Minister finally wants to get the right from the Chair to conclude the debate, even after the Ministers have spoken, Sri Puttaramaiah will be entitled to demand to speak by way of reply. It is only a permissive provision and the normal rule is that the mover of a motion alone has the right to conclude. If there is any inappropriateness in this procedure in a particular case, it is for the chair to decide finally and that too will be in favour of one Minister to conclude and nobody else.

†Indicates that the remarks or speeches have not been revised by the Member concerned

* ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ (ನಂಜನಗೂಡು).— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದವರ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾನಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು ಅಥವಾ ಹತ್ತು ಹದಿನೈದು ಜನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಸಹ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ಮೋಷನ್ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾದ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಒಬ್ಬ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ, ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಈ ಮೋಷನ್ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಚ್ಛಾರತಕ್ಕಂಥವರಿಗೆ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಕಾರದ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುವದಾದರೆ ಇದೇನು ಬಚ್ಚಿಟ್ ಡಿಸ್ಕಷನ್ ಆಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

This is a regular motion sustaining charges against the Ministry and whether the answers given and the explanations furnished are satisfactory or not is a matter for the mover to decide and give a final reply and then the motion has to be put to the vote of the House. The chair cannot allow the discretion to be exercised in this case because in that case all our efforts to move no-confidence will be of no consequence if the ministry is to have the final word. The chair will see the reasonableness of the argument put forward. This cannot be treated as an ordinary budget debate. I would request the chair to make a liberal interpretation of the rule. The debate should conclude after the mover has spoken.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY (Coondapur).—I do not think there is any difficulty in the interpretation of this rule.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am also saying that there is no difficulty.

(Laughter).

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I am afraid this is an inconvenient rule. At the time we framed the rule, we never thought we would get into this mess. My argument is that rule 294 is mandatory. The ordinary rule is that the mover shall have the right to reply but under certain well explained extraordinary circumstances, if the chair feels that the Government has to be given the right of final reply, it may be given. Whether the speaker should undertake to reverse the normal procedure in this case, is a matter to be seriously considered. In order to enable the chair to decide the issue, the Government must make out a case that in the interest of justice they should be given the chance of having the final word. This point has to be considered only after the mover has replied. There is no case just now for the chair to give prospective permission. The question can only arise after the mover has replied and then the Government had made out a case that they should be given permission to reply.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palya).—I endorse fully what my friend said just now. The chair can consider this point only after the mover of the motion has replied to the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After reading rules 294 and 295, one point is clear; that the mover of a motion has a right to reply and the Ministers may

take the opportunity to intervene in the debate and take part in the discussion. In case the Ministers do not take part in the debate, the point is whether the Speaker could permit the Minister or Ministers concerned to reply after the mover has replied to the debate. If it is the opinion of some Hon'ble Members that irrespective of whether the Minister has intervened or not, he should not be given permission to speak after the mover has replied, that is a point left to me decide. That means that in a motion like this, in case the Ministers do not rise to intervene in the debate, and do not speak finally, the Government will nowhere be in the picture. This is a heavy responsibility cast on me. Before I refuse permission I must have sufficient ground to feel that there is no case for the Minister or Ministers concerned to reply at the end after the mover of the motion has replied. I think in his case it should be the last act of mine to refuse the Government the right to reply. So, I would request the Hon'ble mover of the Motion to reply.....

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—To whom?

Mr. SPEAKER.—To the debate. I also understand the difficulty that he may be placed in a disadvantageous position because the Ministers have not replied. I have to construe the rules as they are. It is for the Ministers to intervene in the debate. If they do not intervene in the debate, the House should leave it to me whether I feel right or not to give the Government the right to reply at the end. I feel that there are strong reasons that the debate would be inconclusive and infructuous if do not allow the Minister or Ministers concerned to reply to the debate after the mover has replied.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—The charge is against the Government and not against the Members of the Congress Party. There are direct charges against the ministry.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I can understand. Let the Hon'ble Member make a request.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—It is not the party which is in the dock. It is the Government.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—Even the Members of the ruling party are just like us. They are the same as a Member of this House. There is no distinction between them and as far as this motion is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I can understand the difficulty of the Opposition, but let them kindly listen to me when I say that I have to construe the rules as they are and I feel my construction is correct. One of the Members of the Opposition had said that the discretion whether to give permission or not lay with the Speaker.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—But that is subject to the rules. The charges are against the Ministry. It is for the Hon'ble Mover of the motion to feel that the explanation furnished or clarifications offered are acceptable. If he is not, then the motion has to be voted. Where is it said that the Government should have the last word.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Mallaradhya, is arguing on the merits of the case. I am only concerned with the rule. It is a very simple thing. The Rule says that after the mover has replied, it lies with the speaker to give permission to a Minister or Ministers who want to reply.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Rule 295 is mandatory. It does not give the Speaker any discretion. But if you interpret it that way, I will have to submit to it.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The Chair has interpreted the Rule and given its ruling. Where is the point in discussing it again sir?

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO (Basavanagudi).—Sir, this motion is against the Ministry as such according to the Hon'ble Members on the Opposition side. But it is a Party Ministry and so the Party-Members should be allowed to speak. It is not only customary but it is justice that we are seeking at your hands. The other thing, I wish to know is whether the debate is going to close and whether the mover of the resolution will be asked to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are a few more Members to speak.

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO.—So, we will get a chance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—The motion says: "We the Members of this House" and we have Made definite charges against the Ministry—not against the Congress Party or the Members of the Party. Here, the motion says: "we the Members"—not members of the Opposition. It is clear. This motion is moved by a Member of this House—not only by the Opposition. I am a Member of the House.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—It is your feeling.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—It is my feeling.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point arises, if the motion is adopted.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—This is the first time that a motion of this type is tabled. I request the Speaker to reconsider the ruling.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Supposing we say that we have no quarrel with the ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no ruling.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Or assuming that the Chair has held a certain interpretation as good, that would arise only if the Minister concerned has made a request that he wants to speak and that request is made only after the Member in charge of the Motion, who in this case is the Leader of the Opposition has replied. It would arise only when the Leader of the Opposition has spoken again and if some Minister wants to clarify matters.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Narasimhan has not heard the whole story. The question arose after Sri B. K. Puttaramaiya, Leader of the

Opposition raised the point here. Otherwise, it would not have arisen at all. They are only saying that they are going to reply at the end.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—When the Chief Minister said that they are going to reply, I said that after that, I will reply. That is all.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I draw the attention of the Chair to proviso to sub-rule (3) of Rule 294 ?

“Provided that nothing in this sub-rule shall be deemed to give any right of reply to the mover of an amendment to a Bill or resolution save with the permission of the Speaker”.

In this case, we shall read it as the mover of the resolution. In order to get out of this tangle and also to respect the Ruling that is already given by the Speaker. I would suggest Sir, that the mover may seek the permission of the Chair for replying at the end. He would have no right of reply ordinarily....

Mr. SPEAKER.—It refers only to the mover of an amendment to the Bill or to a Resolution and not to the mover of a resolution.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—If that is the interpretation, it will be that the Speaker's direction becomes binding on us and it rather creates a difficult situation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How we are only discussing the consequences of Rules 294 and 295. In what way does it create any difficulty and to whom it creates the difficulty, let him tell me ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I do not consider that it would be wise now to make any remarks on what the Speaker has already said.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not given any Ruling. I have only given my own interpretation of Rules 294 and 295.

†Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—If that is so, I would seek your permission to say a few words.

1. 30 P.M.

This is not an ordinary resolution. Clause (3) of Rule 294 usually refers to ordinary resolution, not extraordinary type of resolution. The debate has gone on for 1½ days. According to me, very wild allegations have been made against the Government. Now, who is the best authority to rebut all those allegations ? It is the Ministry. They are in possession of information to effectively rebut the wild allegations and charges that the Opposition has made for 1½ days. So, if the Ministers participate at this stage and disillusion my friend the Leader of the Opposition, he might realise his mistake and say ‘Well. I was wrong. You are entitled to have the confidence of the House.’ And he might not press the motion. Instead of that, the mover of the motion is called upon to make a reply. What reply can he give ? He will further reiterate what he has said. So, there is no chance for the Leader of the Opposition to get disillusioned. So in our own interests, in the interests of the Government and the ruling party, I would like the

(Sri K. PUTTASWAMY)

Ministers to come forward and reply. There it does not end. Even after the Ministers reply, if the mover even afterwards persists in his wild charges, they may seek your permission and again to tell a few words so that we may be able to have the correct appreciation of things. Therefore, I would suggest whatever may be our right or not, it is better in the interests of the Government and party for the Ministers to participate at this stage and reserve a right of general reply even after my friend, the Leader of the Opposition gives a reply.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—It is only after the mover of the motion replies, they have got to say whether there is a *prima facie* case made. At this stage, it does not arise.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Your take the stand as to why should it be discussed now. I did not raise it myself. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition has a right to know the position and he has raised it. Now, how can you say that it ought not to have been raised and that it ought to have been taken only at the end. I have not been able to understand your arguments and Sri Narasimhan's arguments. I want that the trouble should be over now. The position should be absolutely clear. I once again say that the Ministers can intervene in the debate, take part in the debate before the mover of the motion replies; but if they do not choose to do that, they may not be allowed to give a reply at the end.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—We have framed definite charges against the Ministry. ತಾವು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದವು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾನು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ರಿಪ್ಲೈ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು? What is there to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He may request them.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—Why should I request them when the Speaker is there?

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—What is surprising is that the Speaker should say that the Government be requested to give a reply.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—His point has arisen only on account of the clarification that he wants. But let them not be under any mistake. In case the Ministers do not take part in the debate now and they want to reply after the mover has replied, I cannot in anyway refuse my permission to them. I have made it clear.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Are you giving a Ruling on the clarification of the interpretation of rules.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Ministers want to intervene in the debate, I cannot in any way stop any Minister from taking part in the debate. Or, if the Ministers do not choose to intervene in the debate and the mover of the motion replies and they want to reply thereafter, I cannot stop them from so doing. I will give the necessary permission. This is my Ruling.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I want to know whether the Ministers are not intervening. Is it the position of the Government that the Ministers do not want to intervene in the debate, that they have no reply to the remarks offered so far.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—That is a matter left to the Ministers. We will see what we can do. We are not bound down by the suggestion of the Honourable Member.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I only want information as to whether they are going to intervene, if they are not going to intervene, the only question is as to whether in accordance with your ruling, Sri Puttaramiya has to reply and all the other consequences will follow. I think this is sufficient ground....

Sri B. D. JATTI.—We will have to watch the proceedings, what type of speeches are going to come, we do not know. We will see at that time. He cannot bind us down like this by making a threat.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, we will go to the subject-matter of the motion.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—If you can fix up the time and date of voting....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the Government require three to four hours ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It means the whole day. Now, I have received notice from Members that they would like to speak on the motion; there are six of them from the Opposition. I think they have had a sufficient opportunity and if they want to take part in the debate, I cannot give much more time. I will have to curtail some more time.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—It may be extended by one more day. This is a very important motion. I am surprised at the Speaker saying that we are wasting Money on this motion. This is a very important motion and this is the first of its kind in the history of this Assembly. I do not think in your regime as Deputy Speaker in the former Bombay Assembly you had ever a chance of hearing such a debate.

MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

(Debate Contd.)

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಪಟ್ಟಾ (ರಾಮದುರ್ಗ) ಸಭಾಮಾನ್ಯರೆ, ಈಗ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಾದ ನಾವು ತಂದಿರುವ, ಸದ್ಯದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳದ ಮೇಲಿನ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಠರಾವಿಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಬೆಂಬಲಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ನಾರ್ಕಾರು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳ ಬಂದಾಗಿನಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತ ಘೋರವೆಯಿಂದ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪೋಲೀಸು ದಳದ ಸಹಾಯ ದಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಒಳನುಚಿನಿಂದ ಹತ್ತಿಕ್ಕಿಬಿಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಗ್ನರಾಗಿ